

# SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

## AMENDED MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

March 16 & 17, 2000  
8:45 a.m.

Wenatchee City Council Chambers  
Wenatchee, Washington

### **SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver (until afternoon break day 1)
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
John Roskelley	Spokane
Jim Peters	Olympia
Stu Trefry	Designee, Conservation Commission (morning day 1)
Steve Meyer	Executive Director, Conservation Commission (afternoon day 1 and 2 <sup>nd</sup> day)
Gerry O'Keefe	Designee, Department of Ecology
Jeff Koenings	Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Jerry Alb	Designee, Department of Transportation

*A tape of the meeting's proceedings is retained by IAC as the formal record of the meeting.*

### **Call to Order:**

Gary Schoessler, Mayor of Wenatchee, welcomed the Salmon Recovery Funding Board to the city of Wenatchee.

After being welcomed to the city, Chair Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at approximately 9:20 a.m. day 1 (March 16, 2000)

### **TOPIC #1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 18, 2000, MEETING IN BREMERTON WASHINGTON:**

Larry Cassidy made the **motion** for approval of the minutes from February 18, 2000 meeting. John Roskelley **seconded** the motion and the Board **Approved**.

### **TOPIC #2 – EARLY 2000 GRANT APPLICATIONS:**

Jim Kramer gave an overview of the Early 2000 Habitat Grant Project Cycle and steps to get to where we currently are. Some of the highlights:

- 1) Passage of 2496 and creation of Lead Entities, and early grant process
- 2) SRFB creation
- 3) Lead Entity process - project solicitation and project evaluation and ranking process last fall. The Lead Entities, in general, did an excellent job in project solicitation and their evaluation process. Most Lead Entities agree and admit that over time we need to figure out a way to get projects proposed that are most supportive in addressing the limiting factors in that area.
- 4) Evaluation and priority setting process used by Lead Entities is also a key part to understand, varies from Lead Entity to Lead Entity. The SRFB provided criteria that were used by some Lead Entities; others used their own criteria due to where they were in their process. Most of

the Lead Entities used a technical team to review projects along with a citizen committee in development of the project list. Lead Entity products to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board include applications received from project sponsors, Lead Entity prioritized lists, and evaluation questions.

- 5) Project review by SRFB staff, looking at projects for eligibility and developing a one page summary of each of the projects, then producing a list in ranked order with staff recommendation on funding level for each Lead Entity.
- 6) Technical evaluation panel and technical review panels – the technical evaluation panel was used to review the projects in the non-lead entity areas. The technical review panels, one for Puget Sound and the Coast and the other for the Columbia Basin projects, were convened to review the Lead Entity process and develop project-funding recommendations to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board. Each Lead Entity made a presentation to the technical review panel; this was a very significant part of this overall effort.

Technical review panels - Jim highlighted the expertise on these panels and named all the members with a quick overview of their individual expertise.

#### **Columbia Basin Panel:**

Jeff Light, Fisheries Biologist, Plum Creek Timber Company  
Timothy Quinn, Habitat Chief Scientist, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Morris Uebelacker, Chair of Geology Department, Central Washington University  
Linda Hardesty, Associated Professor of Range Sciences, Washington State University  
Don Weitkamp, Fisheries Biologist, Parametrix

#### **Puget Sound Panel:**

Kurt Fresh, Fisheries Research Scientist, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife  
George Pess, Habitat Biologist, National Marine Fisheries Service  
Katherine Baril, Social Scientist, WSU Jefferson County Extension  
Chris Frissell, Fisheries Scientist, Flathead Lake Biological Station, University of Montana  
Kate Sullivan, Hydromorphologist, Sustainable Ecosystem Institute

Review Panel members who were at the meeting introduced themselves and gave their perspective of how the process had worked.

#### **PUGET SOUND PANEL**

Kate Sullivan: Process needs work - need to ask more questions and answer our questions first so we know what we are looking for. Fish habitat knowledge, limiting factor information; real information about the watershed; monitoring; the plan; off-site influences; broader array of projects (planning, monitoring, experimental, information gathering); all projects may not need the same detail of monitoring

Ginger Phalen: Agrees with every thing Kate said. Would like to see guidelines developed for the Lead Entities showing what the Board wants from these projects to do. Should have more detailed questions in the applications. Process - allow more time for LE and locals to develop their projects. Don't overwhelm with too many application rounds - one a year should be plenty. Statewide - watersheds should be identified as high priority watersheds for funding priority.

Katherine Baril: When you ask people to do their very best they perform at the highest level and are willing to come back for more. Are we reinventing the wheel? Need both social science and technical science. Need to get past the low hanging fruit (culverts) and get to the more difficult -

challenge citizens into problem solving.

The Puget Sound Panel will be giving the Board a report on their suggested changes.

### **COLUMBIA BASIN PANEL**

Linda Hardesty: Monitoring needed. Missing the feedback into the system so that the monitoring is useful information showing what works and what needs to be done better. Suggests some kind of independent technically skilled resource for monitoring in watersheds. Need to support the collaboration going on - some of these areas are collaborating for the first time and we need to support this. Can also support in planning - not all areas have the resources to develop a good plan and strategy (on going workshops are needed to assist with this). Loan program so projects can get started sooner. This is both a technical and a social effort.

Don Weitkamp: Felt limited in being able to give a valid technical review - would like to have seen all the project information and watershed plan. Would like to see an overall watershed plan. Need to provide guidance on monitoring - there is a lot of information out there on monitoring and it would be very helpful to have monitoring guidelines for the watersheds.

Bill Ruckelshaus asked the panel members how they felt about the idea of an independent monitoring process.

- 1) First step is to develop objectives that should be monitored.
- 2) Some times we learn more by mistakes - so people need to be able feel comfortable reporting what happens.
- 3) Monitoring can take more money - smarter to ask what we need to learn and give good guidance - there are only about six different types of projects need to be monitoring.
- 4) May need a Dow Jones of salmon

Lunch break - reconvened at 1:15 p.m.

### **CONTINUATION OF TOPIC #2 – EARLY 2000 GRANT APPLICATIONS:**

Staff led the Board through a review of results and recommendations, by Lead Entity area.

#### **Lead Entity and Public Comment Period**

**Unaffiliated Area:** Rollie Geppert gave an overview of how the unaffiliated projects were evaluated. This is a large area with three separate recovery regions included. 15 projects were submitted; projects 1-6 recommended for funding by staff.

Comments From:

Frank Hendrix - Unaffiliated area Yakima area. Buffer management - managed grazing enhances salmon. Concerned about why project 00-1001 was removed from funding.

Frank Wesselius – Expressed concerns in regard to low ranking of application #00-1001.

Mike Byrd – Concerns about project number 00-1001. Feels that agriculture is being picked on. Doesn't think acquisition is the right way to go. The SRFB says they want education projects and this is an education project.

**Asotin County** - Rollie gave overview – 18 projects submitted; projects 1-12 recommended for funding by staff.

Comments from:

Brad Johnson - Appreciates the IAC/SRFB and GSRO; they have been helpful and it has been a good experience going before the technical review team.

Steve Martin, WDFW - talked about how the Snake River area is planning their salmon recovery efforts and monitoring efforts happening in the area.

**Chelan County** - Rollie gave overview – 7 projects submitted; all projects recommended for funding by staff.

Comments from:

Mike Kaputa - Wanted to thank the staff for the easy process and ability to work with them.

Appreciated that all Chelan County projects were recommended for funding. Did talk about administrative funding for lead entities to continue to produce good projects. Also discussed match options for future funding cycles - noted that some projects were not presented due to lack of match moneys.

**Grays Harbor** - Marc Duboiski gave overview - 8 projects submitted; staff recommended projects 1 – 4.

No Lead Entity reps were present for Grays Harbor - a letter had been sent to the Board and was included in the SRFB handouts

**Hood Canal Coordinating Council** - Lynn Palensky gave the overview - 24 projects submitted; staff recommended funding projects 1 - 12

Comments from:

Jay Watson - would like to support the staff recommendation, wants to protect the integrity of the Lead Entity process and following staff recommendation will honor this.

**Island County** - will wait until later to cover this since no one was present to testify

**King County WRIA 8** - will wait until later to cover this since no one was present to testify

**King County WRIA 9** - Mark Duboiski gave the overview - 4 projects submitted; staff recommended funding of one project.

Comments from:

Clint Loper - King County WRIA 9 representative - started off thanking board for hard work. Staff recommendation is fully supported. Discussed WRIA 9 process and development of project list.

Judith Nobel – SRFB grant will give option to let the steering committee go back and raise the rest of the money for this project (Duwamish).

**Kitsap County** - Lynn Palensky gave the overview - submitted 6 projects; staff recommended funding one project partially.

Comments from:

Jeff Davis - Discussed Kitsap County's process and status of different projects in the area.

Kitsap County has already worked through the least expensive projects and is now into the higher dollar projects.

**Klickitat County** - Rollie gave overview of this area - six projects submitted and staff recommended one project.

Comments from:

Ray Hennekey - Will not be answering questions about projects. Instead spoke about process.

Felt that the morning discussion lacked respect for the Lead Entity process. Heard the Board say that there is no expertise in the local areas. Concerned about getting too much guidance. Wants to propose putting money into capacity building grants.

Chairman Ruckelshaus addressed Mr. Hennekey's concern about the Board giving too much guidance by assuring him that what "we" talked about in the morning includes the Lead Entities along with everyone in the state, as needed, to get the job done.

**Lower Columbia** - will wait until later to cover this since no one was present to testify

**Mason County** - will wait until later to cover this since no one was present to testify

**Nisqually River Salmon Recovery** - will wait until later to cover this since no one is here to testify

**North Olympic Peninsula** - Lynn Palensky gave the overview - submitted 16 projects; staff recommended funding projects 1 through 5.

Comments from:

John Cambalik - Wants to thank Board, review team, and staff during this funding cycle. Fully supportive of the review team process and staff's recommendations for this funding cycle. John gave an overview of what the Lead Entity needs to be successful. If there is any extra money, requested funding the number 6 project on their list.

**Okanogan County and Colville Tribe Lead Entity** - Rollie gave the overview of this area - 13 projects submitted; staff recommended funding of projects 1 - 7

Comments from:

Hilary Lyman - talked about project 8 (Salmon Creek), which was not recommended for funding. Discussed the Limiting Factors Analysis and feels that the LF that is currently being done by the Conservation Commission is not a good LFA but a listing of current data. Stated that if the Board does not fund this project they would send the wrong message.

Spencer Higby - discussed the peril in the Methow Valley and the need to fund projects 9 through 13. He reflects the feelings of a majority of the citizens in the Valley.

Dick Ewing - Read the letter from Representative Parlette in support of funding the projects in the Methow Valley and her concern with the economic sensitivity in this area.

Lee Bernheisel - Citizen comment. Feels we are rewarding the abusive uses of water by paying for bad behavior.

**Pacific County** - Marc Duboiski gave the overview - submitted 9 projects; staff recommended projects 1 through 5.

Comments from:

Ron Craig - Pacific County is a poor county with no help from WDFW or other agencies.

Everyone was invited to join the citizen's team and everyone was included. The SRFB process has allowed the area to get together and work on the committee. Wants the Board to fund staff recommended list. Please do not change the citizen committee priority list. This area does not need to be educated - they have expertise in their area. Strategy is a bottom up approach to salmon recovery. Appreciates the process and would ask the Board to fund up to project number 7.

**Pierce County** - will wait until later to cover this since no one was present to testify

**Skagit Watershed Council** - Marc Duboiski gave the overview for this area - submitted 27 projects on three different lists; staff recommends funding b1 through b3 and a1 through a5.

Comments from:

Shirley Solomon - Would like to commend the group for their hard work. Pointed out a couple projects that would be good for funding if the Board has additional money to allocate. No projects on private timberland or that are legally required. Focus on voluntary efforts

Carolyn Kelly - Clarified the issue of buffer width in Skagit County.

**Snohomish County** - will wait until later to cover this since no one was present to testify

**Thurston County** - Mike Ramsey gave the overview of this area - seven projects were submitted; staff did not recommend any projects for funding.

Comments from:

Scott Brummer - Thurston County CD and representative for the Lead Entity. Wanted to stress the group's cooperation and need for funding to continue with their efforts. Would like funding of the number one project on their list.

**Whatcom** - Mike Ramsey gave the overview of this area - submitted 15 projects; staff recommended the top 5 projects.

Comments from:

George Boggs - Whatcom Conservation District - Very late and very long day and glad for the patience of the Board since this process will need patience to get salmon recovered.

### **General Public Testimony**

Susan Ruffo – The Nature Conservancy of Washington - thanked everyone for the process and

appreciates the openness of the process and fairness of the process. As a result of this process many projects that are good for the salmon will be funded.

Recessed at approximately 7:50 p.m.

**March 17, 2000 Day 2 of the SRFB Funding allocation meeting  
Second day opened at approximately 8:15 a.m.**

Laura Johnson reviewed the day's schedule and gave a budget update.

**TOPIC #3 – LEGISLATIVE UPDATE & STATUS REPORTS**

**Budget Update:**

\$20.9 million remaining in State Funds  
\$13.8 million remaining in Federal Funds  
\$34.7 total remaining in SRFB budget

This amount will need to last through the biennium.

**Legislative Issues:**

Jim Fox

Jim reviewed bills still active in session. There are currently five budgets on the table.

**Policy Issues:**

Jim Fox presented policy issues needing clarification prior to funding decisions.

**1. Geographic distribution of grant funds**

Jim discussed past allocation of funds and three possible approaches to allocation of funds.

- 1) Allocate a specific percentage of funds to each Salmon Recovery Region, lead entity area, or WRIA. This could be done based on some definition of the word "equitable" and on the status of the salmon stocks and the habitat on which they depend. This approach was used by the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office to distribute the \$19 million in federal FY99 funds. The distribution formula was based on an "equal" allocation by Recovery Region.
- 2) Evaluate every project at a state level and rank them in a single list. The regional distribution of funds will be determined by the location of the highest priority projects. This is the approach used by the Interagency Review Team (IRT) in the "Early Action" (1999) grant cycle.
- 3) Evaluate prioritized lists of projects submitted by lead entities and provide funding for the part of the list that is determined to have the greatest potential benefits for salmon and the highest certainty that these benefits will be realized. The regional distribution of funds will be determined by the areas represented by project lists with the highest level of funding. This is the approach being utilized by the SRFB for this Early 2000 grant cycle.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends that for the Early 2000 grant cycle the Board use

approach number 3 and not attempt to distribute funds by geographic region. However, the Board should continue to work with the scientific community to foster the development of recovery goals and scientific methods to help the Board be more strategic in allocating its resources.

**Board Decision (Consensus):**

Following discussion, the Board agreed with staff recommendation for this round.

**2. Lead Entity vs. SRFB project ranking**

The legislation creating the SRFB is unclear to what extent the Board has the authority to re-rank project lists submitted by lead entities<sup>1</sup>. The legislation states that “The board may reject, but not add, projects from a habitat project list submitted by a lead entity for funding.” The legislation also says, “In evaluating, ranking, and awarding funds for projects and activities the board shall...” implying that the Board does have the authority to rank projects. Section 7 of the legislation, vetoed by the Governor, clearly would have given the technical review team the responsibility of “screening and ranking projects on such lists...” and providing its ranking of projects to the Board.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the rank order of projects submitted by lead entities be respected unless there are compelling scientific reasons and strong review panel recommendations to the contrary. In this grant cycle lead entities were not asked to provide detailed information about individual projects in their presentations to the review panels. Panelists were provided with a one-page summary of each project, but not until the first day of the panel meeting. As a result, reviewers’ information on individual projects was incomplete and often influenced by chance personal knowledge of one panel member.

There were several instances where the ranking of a lead entity’s projects was determined, in part, by socio-economic criteria that were not directly linked to salmon benefits. However, SRFB grant guidelines allowed lead entities to develop their own evaluation criteria for the Early 2000 cycle. In addition, these lead entities made the argument that by considering socio-economic impacts of projects they were able to garner the participation and support of local elected officials, citizen committee members, and the community at large. They argued that this support would, in the long run, have significant benefits to the region’s salmon recovery efforts.

**Board Decision (Consensus):**

Concur with staff recommendation.

**3. Projects considered experimental in nature**

As mentioned elsewhere, a number of projects submitted for funding utilize techniques that are considered by the scientific community to be unproven. Examples include engineered logjams, eelgrass re-establishment, reconstruction of tidal estuaries, and water conservation for in-stream flows.

**Recommendation.** Staff recommends that some projects deemed “experimental” in nature by the review panels be funded. If an increased level of monitoring and evaluation of the project would provide important information about the effectiveness of an experimental technique, sponsors should be urged to submit a proposal for additional SRFB funding for monitoring the project and sharing the information with the scientific community. The SRFB should revisit this

---

<sup>1</sup> 2E2SSB5595



policy for future funding cycles.

**Board Decision (Consensus):**

Concur with Staff Recommendation

**4. Acquisition vs. Regulation**

There were requests for funds for acquisition of riparian habitat in counties with land use regulations that are very protective of stream corridors (King County) and counties with regulations that were viewed as minimal or inadequate by the review panels (Skagit County). Some reviewers argued that the need for protection through acquisition was greater in locations with inadequate regulations since the potential threat to the riparian habitat is greater. Other reviewers suggested that counties with inadequate regulations should not be “rewarded” by receiving SRFB funding.

**Recommendation.** Staff recommends that this issue be discussed when developing guidelines for future grant cycles.

**Board Decision (Consensus):**

Concur with staff recommendation

**5. Projects that are the legal obligation of the landowner**

SRFB grant guidelines required that project sponsors and lead entities identify projects that may be required of the landowner under current local, state or federal laws and to explain why expenditure of public funds on these projects is justified. A number of such projects were submitted.

**Recommendation.** Staff recommends that the SRFB not withhold funds from such projects unless there is compelling evidence that funding of such a project would not provide significant benefits to salmon or would be accomplished even if SRFB funding were not awarded. This issue should be revisited at the April 7<sup>th</sup> workshop and in light of SHB2589 for the fall funding cycle.

**Board Discussion.** The Board discussed the importance of being able to fund these types of projects when there are clear benefits to acting now rather than waiting for the problem to be corrected as a result of the regulatory process. Several members pointed out that the legislation just passed by the Legislature (ESHB2589), although not yet in effect, will set high standards for funding these types of projects. The bill will allow the Board to fund this type of project when expedited action provides a clear benefit to salmon recovery and there will be harm to salmon recovery if the project is delayed.

One Board member indicated that he will be consistent in opposing culvert projects since he believes the landowner should take the responsibility to correct them. Two other members agreed, but indicated that there are cases where SRFB funding is justified.

**Board Decision.** The Board will not automatically withhold funds from projects that are the legal obligation of the landowners, but will critically examine individual projects to make sure the benefits to the salmon clearly justify the use of public funds.

In closing, Jim also noted there are other policy issues that the Board will need to discuss in the

near future; many issues will be covered at the April 7<sup>th</sup> workshop.

#### **TOPIC #4 – REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND DECISIONS ON EARLY 2000 GRANT APPLICATIONS:**

During this portion of the meeting, only four voting members of the Board were present. Larry Cassidy was absent due to a previous commitment. Three “yes” votes were needed to take action.

##### **ASOTIN COUNTY (WRIAS 32, 33, 35)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Projects #1-12, \$930,555. This is a very important region for salmon recovery. Projects #1-12 are largely based on completed planning efforts and build on past efforts in the affected stream systems.

**Board Discussion:** One Board member raised concern about project #7 because the sediment basin addresses the symptoms and not the cause of the sedimentation problem.

**Board Decision:** Fund Projects #1-12. (#1-6 received 4 votes, #7 received 3 votes, & #8-12 received 4 votes)

##### **CHELAN COUNTY (WRIAS 40, 45, 46, 47)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Projects #1-7, \$1,069,903, with the condition that for projects 5 and 6 the County can provide assurance to SRFB staff that there is a commitment to addressing upstream protection issues.

**Board Discussion:** Several Board members expressed opposition to projects #5 and 6, both culvert replacements, on the grounds that they should be the responsibility of the landowner to correct. A member stated opposition to project #7 on the grounds that the County should be responsible for correcting its roads. One Board member pointed out the tremendous progress in cooperation in Chelan County and urged the need to support the various participating entities. Another member indicated support for all seven projects.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-4. (#1-4 received 4 votes, #5-7 received 2 votes)

##### **GRAYS HARBOR COUNTY (WRIA 22, 23)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Projects #1-4, \$130,246. These projects address two main limiting factors – reconnecting off-channel habitat and improving fish passage.

**Board Discussion:** Several Board members opposed projects #2, 3, and 4 (culvert correction) on the grounds that they should be the responsibility of the landowner. Some were supportive of project #6, Humptulips Acquisition, noting the number of partners involved and the amount of habitat protected. They stated their view that this project more clearly met a priority need of the watershed and helped preserve good functioning habitat. Another Board member urged the importance of sticking to the priorities established by the lead entity.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1 and 6. (#1 received 4 votes, #2 received 1 vote, #3 & 4 received 2 votes, & #6 received 4 votes)

## **HOOD CANAL COORDINATING COUNCIL (WRIAS 14, 15, 16, 17)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Projects #1-12, \$1,184,470. It is difficult to draw a clear line for funding. The top part of the project list is strongly based on recovery of the endangered Chum stocks as well as builds on past efforts.

**Board Discussion:** Board members expressed a number of concerns about project #3, Big Beef Creek, including the presence of artificially produced fish, the role of the University of Washington, and the research value of the project. One member opposed the project because it involved non-native fish. Others supported it because of its research value. There was a question about the compatibility of the list of projects with the newly completed Summer Chum report. Two members were opposed to project #10, the Courtney Creek Fish Passage Barrier project, because it should be the obligation of the landowner to correct it. Others supported it because it would open a large area of potential habitat and because of confidence in the lead entity's ranking process.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-9, 11, and 12. (#1 & 2 received 4 votes, #3 received 3 votes, #4-9 received 4 votes, #10 received 2 votes, #11 & 12 received 4 votes)

## **ISLAND COUNTY (WRIA 6)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Considering the conclusions of the panel, no funding was recommended at this time for projects, but encourage Island County to pursue inventory and feasibility funding in future rounds or from other sources. The staff also recommend the SRFB fund a nearshore habitat prioritization effort and in the future make money available for feasibility studies that could be used by Island County as well as other lead entities and potential project sponsors.

**Board Discussion:** One Board member suggested that no lead entity should be turned away "empty-handed." Another suggested approving project #4, the Maxwellton Tide Gate, because of some compelling letters of support. There was discussion about the importance of nearshore habitat projects and the need to send the message that these types of projects should be encouraged. If the Island County projects are not funded, staff should work with representatives of Island County, other lead entities bordering on marine waters, and nearshore habitat experts to help identify nearshore habitat needs and potential projects.

**Board Decision:** No funding. (Unanimous)

## **KING COUNTY (WRIA 8)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund projects #1-3, \$570,000. These projects are all acquisitions of key habitat in Bear Creek and Cedar River. They build on a long-term program in both systems with significant matching funds. They are also focused largely on benefits for Chinook. These systems are listed as having critically depressed native Chinook stocks, but are not one of the major producers in Puget Sound.

**Board Discussion:** There was concern by one Board member about acquisition on the Cedar when there is a question about the ability of the upper Cedar watershed to meet the needs for

Chinook. Another member favored funding projects #4 and 5 on the Cedar.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-3. (#1-3 received 4 votes, #4 & 5 received 1 vote)

### **KING COUNTY (WRIA 9)**

**Staff Recommendation.** Project #2, partial funding: \$500,000. This project would acquire a site for restoration in the Duwamish River estuary and potentially benefit multiple stocks. Only partial funding is recommended because of the high cost relative to the overall SRFB funds in this grant round, and the uncertainty of the ultimate benefit. The acquisition projects in the Green are good proposals, but may need more landowner and community outreach to increase the certainty for support. The Big Spring project also appears to be a good project, but will not realize its full potential until it is restored through Corp of Engineer funds in 2003.

**Board Discussion.** Since the projects were not ranked by the lead entity, there was considerable discussion about whether project #2 was the right project to fund. One Board member expressed the opinion that the overall benefit of this project to the watershed is not known. Another member stated that the project is opportunistic but important. Several members pointed out the importance of estuarine areas in protecting a run. There was concern over the high cost of the project and the ability of the sponsor to raise the additional money needed to complete it. One Board member was interested in project #1, Metzler Park Addition, and expressed the desire to fund it if additional money is available.

**Board Decision.** Partial funding of project #2, \$500,000 (Unanimous)

### **KITSAP COUNTY (EAST KITSAP LEAD ENTITY, PART OF WRIA 15)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Project #1, \$368,150. The lead entity has provided a strong project list and the County is developing a comprehensive approach to recovery. Only one project is proposed for funding based on the size of the stream network and the limited funds available from the SRFB in this grant cycle.

**Board Discussion:** Agreed with recommendation.

**Board Decision:** Fund project #1 (Unanimous)

### **Klickitat County (WRIAS 29, 30)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Project #1, \$300,000.

**Board Discussion:** Agreed with recommendation

**Board Decision:** Fund project #1 (Unanimous)

### **LOWER COLUMBIA FISH RECOVERY BOARD (WRIAS 25-29)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Projects #1-12, \$1,523,314. Plus further refinement of issues raised by the panel on #'s 4,6 and 7.

**Board Discussion:** Several Board members expressed concerns about projects #8, 9, 10 and 12 because they were culverts and should be the obligation of the landowners to correct. Others noted that these culverts open up a large amount of habitat and were identified as high priority projects by a very capable lead entity. A Board member pointed out that project #10, Birnie Creek, involved a number of partnerships and would affect additional projects that the partners were involved in.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-7, 10, and 11. (#1-7 received 4 votes, #8 & 9 received 2 votes, #10 received 3 votes, #11 received 4 votes, & #12 & 13 received 2 votes)

#### **MASON COUNTY (WRIA 14)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund Project #1, \$57,194.

**Board Discussion:** One Board member expressed concern that the project is a culvert and should be the obligation of the landowner. However, it appears to benefit the fish and the sponsor is paying for most of it (65%). Another Board member expressed the opinion that this project is not a legal obligation since it was in compliance at the time it was originally constructed.

**Board Decision:** Fund project #1. (Unanimous)

### **NISQUALLY RIVER SALMON RECOVERY (WRIA 11)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund projects 1 and 2, \$282,715. These projects protect significant habitat areas in the Nisqually and build on a long-term set of actions to protect the mainstem.

**Board Discussion:** One Board member pointed out that there is an excellent plan for the Nisqually and some excellent work has been accomplished. There was no further discussion.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1, & 2. (Unanimous)

### **NORTH OLYMPIC PENINSULA LEAD ENTITY (WRIAS 17, 18, 19, 20)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund Projects #1-5, \$1,308,840. The area is a very important to the overall recovery in the Puget Sound and Coast. The Dungeness and Elwha have critically depressed native Chinook stocks under the SASSI inventory. The Sekiu River logjam project should only be funded if it is closely coordinated with similar work in the Nooksack and Stillaguamish. The Dungeness water conservation project should only be funded if sponsors can demonstrate that the saved water will provide fish benefits, and the project's timing is consistent with the priorities in the Dungeness Plan. All the recommended projects should have a high level of monitoring and contingency planning that may increase the costs over current estimates.

**Board Discussion:** There were a number of questions about the actual amount of water that would be "put back into the stream" in project #4, the Dungeness Water Conservation project. For project #5, Jimmycomelately Restoration, there was concern expressed about DOT's obligation to provide the bridge, and about sediment sources and road conditions in the upper watershed.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-5. (Unanimous)

### **OKANOGAN COUNTY AND COLVILLE TRIBE (WRIAS 48, 49)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund projects #1-7, \$803,354. The staff recommends funding the seven highest priority projects to address critical water use issues in the Methow. It does not recommend funding Salmon Creek due to the limited SRFB funds in this grant cycle and the large long-term nature of the project. There are several other funding sources being pursued simultaneously by the Methow organizations. Before a final decision is made on SRFB funding, there should be assessment of the funding status for these projects from other sources.

**Board Discussion:** Board members recognized the social and economic benefits of a number of these projects. Concern was expressed by several Board members that for some of the projects clear benefits to the fish had not been adequately demonstrated, especially projects #4 and 6. Several members also expressed their opinion that some of the projects should be the obligation of the landowner, especially since they have had years to comply with the legal requirements. Several other Board members urged that the lead entity ranking be honored because the Board did not have enough information to be making funding decisions project-by-project.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-3, 5, 7 and 8. (#1-3 received 4 votes, #5 received 4 votes, #7 received 4 votes, & #8 received 3 votes) Projects #4 and 6, if applying for funds in the next grant cycle, should provide more information about fish benefits.

## **PACIFIC COUNTY (WRIA 24)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund projects #1-5, \$189,206. This honors and supports the development of the lead entity process. There are questions about the priority of these types of projects before sediment and other limiting factors have been addressed. However, the local process has developed these recommendations after an extensive evaluation and should be supported. Projects #1-4 address fish passage for a relatively low cost and project #5 is a key acquisition and restoration of tidal emergent wetlands.

**Board Discussion:** Two Board members believed that projects #1, 3, and 4, all fish passage projects, should be the obligation of the landowner and do not have benefits to salmon that are as great as some of the lower-ranked projects.

One Board member expressed the importance of following the priorities of the lead entity in order to keep participants engaged and working together. He pointed out that the Board should help lead entities in their early stages come together, but that they, in turn, at some point need to step up with projects that are the highest priority in their watersheds. Other members believed that the lead entity had over-emphasized socio-economic criteria, resulting in the best salmon projects being ranked low on their list.

A number of Board members expressed support for project #7 because of the review panel recommendations, the result of the lead entity ranking process, and the importance of estuarine habitat. Another expressed concern that, even though project #7 seemed to provide the greatest benefits to fish, it sent an unsupportive message to lead entities, if the Board moved down to the seventh-ranked project on a list. Others supported project #7 since it would help preserve important functioning estuarine habitat.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #2, 5, 6, & 7. (#1 received 2 votes, #2 received 4 votes, #3 & 4 received 2 votes, #5 received 4 votes, #6 received 3 votes, & #7 received 3 votes)

## **PIERCE COUNTY (WRIAS 10, 12)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund projects #1 – 5, \$275,091. The first five projects on the lead entity list address limiting factors by creation of off-channel habitat or correction of fish barriers restricting access to high quality habitat. The Puyallup is listed as having critically depressed native Chinook stocks in the SASSI inventory.

**Board Discussion:** Several Board members expressed a concern that project #5, a fish passage barrier project on private timber company land, should be the obligation of the landowner to correct and that it would fall under the Forest and Fish agreement.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-4. (#1-4 received 4 votes & #5 received 1 vote)

## **SKAGIT WATERSHED COUNCIL (WRIAS 3, 4)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Projects #b1-b3, a1-a5; \$1,337,897. This recommendation would fund the highest priority protection and restoration projects. It responds to the 60:40 ratio recommended by the Skagit Watershed Council.

**Board Discussion:** Several Board members expressed concern about projects a2-a5, due to a low match, the belief that they should be the obligation of the landowner to accomplish, and that they did not appear to be critical at this time. Another member felt that because separate lists of acquisition and restoration projects were submitted by the lead entity, the Board should not be bound to the 60:40 split recommended by the lead entity.

Several Board members pointed out the importance of the estuary project, #a6, and the need to protect this part of the life cycle of the salmon.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #b1, b2, b3, a1, and a6. (b1, b2, b3, & a1 received 4 votes, a2-a5 received 1 vote, & a6 received 3 votes)

### **SNOHOMISH COUNTY (WRIA 5, 7)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Projects #1-3, \$1,253,520. The top three projects are addressing key habitats in these important river systems. It is important to ensure that the #1 project is used primarily for salmon benefits. There was some uncertainty about the potential for other uses of the site.

**Board Discussion:** Board members expressed a concern about the whether the conservation easement in project #3, Ricci Island, would provide enough protection to warrant the investment. They pointed out that there is already significant regulatory protection and were concerned that the conservation easement may not address potential grazing impacts.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-3. (Unanimous) Staff should make sure the conservation easement will provide the desired habitat protection.

### **THURSTON COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT (WRIA 13)**

**Staff Recommendation:** The staff does not recommend any project funding at this time. They agree with the review panel conclusions that the SRFB should support the lead entity and citizen committee in developing a comprehensive approach.

**Board Discussion:** Several Board members expressed an interest in funding project #1, the engineered log-jam project, to provide information on the value of this technique. The Board discussed the value of funding at least one project for this lead entity in order to keep the participants engaged and motivated. Others pointed out, however, that the project's benefit to the fish should be the primary reason for funding it.

**Board Decision:** Fund project #1. (#1 received 3 votes) The applicant, WDFW staff, and SRFB staff will work together to develop a plan to evaluate the techniques being utilized and assess the value of the project.

### **WHATCOM COUNTY (WRIA 1)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund projects #1–5, \$1,278,028. The Nooksack is a very important system having critically depressed native Chinook stocks under the SASSI inventory.

**Board Discussion:** Project #2, Larson's Bridge Historic Scale Log Jam, uses techniques that



are considered experimental. The project should be well monitored to provide useful feedback to project sponsor and other people around the state planning to utilize similar techniques. As the Board reviews the rest of the projects, members should think about how many of them to fund.

One Board member stated that project #5, a culvert, should be the responsibility of the county to correct. Other members pointed out that the habitat upstream from the culvert is in good condition and facing no immediate threat and the project benefits several stocks, is relatively inexpensive and has a good match, and needs to be done right away.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-5. (#1-4 received 4 votes & #5 received 3 votes) Sponsors of project #2 should work with WDFW staff to develop a monitoring plan in order to evaluate the techniques being utilized. (The dissenting vote was in relation to project # 5.)

#### **UNAFFILIATED PROJECTS (NO LEAD ENTITY) (WRIAS 2, 31, 37-39, A PORTION OF 40, 41-44 AND 50-62)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Projects #1-6, \$1,027,050. These projects provide significant benefits to key habitat in two major river systems of the Columbia basin. Project #5 should not be funded until an assessment is made of the implications of the Forest and Fish Agreement.

**Board Discussion:** Concern over projects #5 and 6 were expressed by several Board members due to their belief that they are the legal obligation of the property owners to accomplish and the benefits to the watershed are not clear. Two Board members suggested project #8, the Umtanum Creek project, should be funded.

**Board Decision:** Fund projects #1-4 (#1 - #4 received 4 votes, and #8 received 2 votes)

Brenda McMurray made the **motion** for adoption of Resolution #2000-02, which adopts these Salmon Recovery Funding Board Early 2000 Habitat Project Grant Cycle Funding decisions (see attached Resolution and list of funded projects). John Roskelley **seconded** the motion and the Board **Adopted**.

#### **TOPIC #5 - APRIL 7 WORKSHOP:**

Jim Kramer gave an overview of the current status of the meeting arrangements so far. This workshop will be held at St. Edwards State Park in Kenmore and will have several breakout groups. Invitations will go out within next week or two; inviting LE, Legislators and their staff; SRFB. This workshop is being organized by a steering committee composed of several lead entity representatives and agency staff, who want to make sure this workshop is very productive.

#### **Adjournment**

The next meeting of the SRFB is a work session scheduled for April 20 and 21, 2000, in Bellingham.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Attest, SRFB APPROVAL:

\_\_\_\_\_  
William Ruckelshaus, Chair                      Date                      Approved on \_\_\_\_\_

Future Meetings:      April 20-21, 2000 (Bellingham)  
                                 May 23-24, 2000 (TBA)  
                                 June 20-21, 2000 (TBA)

G:\TammyO\SRFB Meetings\March 16-17 2000\3\_1617\_00 Minutes.doc